



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,511

10/24/2003

Maria Dalko

231042US0

7410

22850

7590

01/26/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

1940 DUKE STREET

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CHUI, MEI PING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1609

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

31 DAYS

01/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,511

Applicant(s)

DALKO ET AL.

Examiner

Helen Mei-Ping Chui

Art Unit

1609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a process for treating dry skin and/or dry scalp using composition comprising at least one oxysterol selected from the group consisting of 5-cholesten-3 β ,25-diol-7-one and esters and ethers thereof, classified in class 514, subclass 506, 844, for example.
- II. Claims 6-7, drawn to a process for treating one or more forms of dermatitis associated with oligoseborrhoeic dry skin, using composition comprising, in a physiologically acceptable medium, at least one oxysterol selected from the group consisting of 5-cholesten-3 β ,25-diol-7-one and esters and ethers thereof, classified in class 514, subclass 506, 861, 863, for example.
- III. Claims 8-20, drawn to a composition comprising, in the form of an oil-in-water emulsion, at least one oxysterol selected from the group consisting of 5-cholesten-3 β ,25-diol-7-one and the esters and ethers thereof, and at least one compound selected from the group consisting of a desquamating agent, a moisturizer, a calmative, an agent for promoting keratinocyte proliferation and/or differentiation, and an antibacterial agent, classified in class 514, subclass 62,

Art Unit: 1600

159, 474; and, in part, classified in class 424, subclass 70.1, 70.13, 74, 78.07, 195.17, 739, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I (or II) and Group III are related as process of use and product. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process as claimed can be practiced with a materially different product such as collagen, for example.

Inventions I and II are directed to patentably distinct processes of using composition comprising at least one oxysterol selected from the group consisting of 5-cholesten-3 β ,25-diol-7-one and esters and ethers thereof. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, invention I does not require the recited elements, one or more forms of dermatitis, of invention II. While the processes of inventions I and II are drawn to using similar compositions, the processes of the two inventions

Art Unit: 1600

are drawn to different effects and outcomes. (as well as patient population?)

This application contains claims directed to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: a desquamating agent, a moisturizer, a calmative, an agent for promoting keratinocyte proliferation and/or differentiation, an antibacterial agent. The species are independent or distinct because they are either not capable of use together, do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species in Claim 8, such as a desquamating agent, a moisturizer, a calmative, an agent for promoting keratinocyte proliferation and/or differentiation, an antibacterial agent. Applicant is also required to identify a single disclosed agent from the above elected species thereof, for instance: salicylic acid as a desquamating agent (Claim 10), glycosphingolipids as a moisturizer (Claim 11), cortisone as a calmative (Claim 12), retinol as an agent for promoting keratinocyte proliferation (Claim 13), or triclosan as an antibacterial agent (Claim 14), for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any

Art Unit: 1600

claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search and would present an undue burden of search on the Examiner (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be completed must include (i) an election of a single disclosed invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made

Art Unit: 1600

with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should direct to Helen Mei-Ping Chui whose telephone number is 571-272-9078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am – 5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang or Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0811 and 571-272-0562, respectively.

Art Unit: 1600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either PRIVATE PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through PRIVATE PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the PRIVATE PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Cecilia J. Tsang
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600